

Sent from my iPhone
Michael D'Elia, Director
BIAero, LLC

On Sep 15, 2012, at 8:35 AM, Michael Delia wrote:

Iberdrola's argument assumes the positive benefit of wind energy and argues for its institution. In Rhode Island, PUC docket 4111 proved to be so 'economically unreasonable" that the PUC unanimously turned down the long term, 20 year PPA; which was scheduled to cost the ratepayers \$400 million dollars in excess energy costs over 20 years, while shutting down no fossil fuel plants, moving coal to the top of the necessary standby power plants and leaving the state with turbine maintenance and 6 permanent jobs from a total investment and energy cost of \$800 million dollars.

The science is bad. It goes not reduce ultimate greenhouse emissions. Coal fired plants stay on line as intermittent backup. The economics are bad. The ratepayers pay charges as much as 5 times the going rate locked in. The business is bad. The taxpayers are subsidizing big hedge fund money on otherwise non fundable, unprofitable business schemes.

Say no! Fund a different solution to your problem.

Sent from my iPhone
Michael D'Elia, Director
BIAero, LLC

On Sep 14, 2012, at 9:41 PM, Maggie Delia wrote:

----- Forwarded Message

From: Cindy Ihrke

Date: Fri, 14 Sep 2012 14:16:53 -0500

To: Cindy Ihrke

Subject: DEADLINE TOMORROW! Public Comment on Illinois Power Agency's Draft 5-Year Plan

Sorry for any duplication but THIS IS SOOOO IMPORTANT!!! Please read below for a good explanation why. (Thanks Carolyn!) Even if you are from out of state please consider commenting on wind is not sensible. Please share this information with others that will comment. Thanks!

Cindy

You have gotten notices from Cindy before but I just wanted to alert you all that the deadline for comments is tomorrow at midnight! See below for IPA's memo on how to comment. The **State is legally obligated to consider your comments**. You can file a "blunt force" comment against the Renewable Portfolio Standard and subsidies for wind or you can be more specific.

The last few years there have been virtually NO comments from wind victims or energy consumers so any comments *against* wind will present a different picture than what the IPA sees right now. Right now Illinois law mandates wind or RECs, but a big issue is whether the State should enter into long term contracts. The wind companies take the position that long term contracts are better because that helps them get financing because investors see that Illinois is on the hook for this overpriced energy for years. Of course that's better for the wind companies, not so good for consumers and businesses in Illinois: The latest ICC order lists dozens of comments from "the public," including this one from the Illinois Wind Energy Association:

15. IWEA Position

In response to Iberdrola's compromise offer, IWEA concurs with Iberdrola's characterization of the workshop process under the Plan approved in Docket No. 09-0373. IWEA generally supports the proposal that workshops be held after the conclusion of this proceeding to develop a better long-term renewable energy contract. IWEA also agrees with the proposed structure and timeline for the workshops. **IWEA explains that many of its members rely on the ability to procure long-term contracts for the purpose of securing financing for the development of future projects and the general sustainability of their business. Therefore, any effort to further development of a viable long-term contract is very important to IWEA members. IWEA, however, does not support the procurement of five-year RECs. IWEA believes that it is misplaced to** 10-0563 80

continue to place emphasis on shorter term, unbundled renewable products. Rather, IWEA continues, the central focus of renewable procurement should be on long-term products and advancement of the workshop process is a positive step in the right direction. According to IWEA, the IPA should be focused on long-term unbundled renewable energy contracts, rather than one-year or mid-term products. IWEA avers that only long-term contracts will facilitate the development and financing of wind energy projects for Illinois.

(http://www2.illinois.gov/ipa/Pages/Prior_Approved_Plans.aspx, p. 79)

Big Wind wants to get the State's consumers and businesses on the hook for long-term contracts because that will force the State (and indirectly the feds) to support wind energy for the duration of the contracts, which last up to 20 years. As it is now, if the Governor or legislature cancelled the RPS, wind would have to compete with traditional forms of energy on a level playing field. And they can't. Not even with federal tax credits. This is what we are fighting.

Comments can be submitted by email as follows:

Comments to the Draft Plan can be submitted to the IPA in care of Julie Musselman Oost at JOost@KelleyDrye.com. Comments will then be formatted for posting to the IPA's website at <http://www.illinois.gov/ipa>.

When you draft your comment, please be aware that they are **public** comments and they will be posted on the IPA's website with name and affiliation listed. See here for the draft plan itself for those who want to read it: <http://www2.illinois.gov/ipa/documents/2013-Procurement-Plan-PUBLIC-COMMENT-8-15-11-corrected-figure-captions.pdf>.

Please copy me on your comment. Don't be shy. Wind is currently mandated and this Draft Plan is about how to implement the mandate. HOWEVER, **this is an opportunity to ask the State to question the mandate and limit its negative impacts.** So please submit comments that (1) long-term commitments will hurt consumers, damage the State's overall economy by imposing higher energy costs than are necessary, and add (2) the wind companies have no right to ask for long-term commitments when they are damaging your quality of life, your property value, your business value (if applicable), our economy, killing our birds, killing our bats, ETC. Our IWW comment will focus on protection of consumers and the IL economy as these are difficult, uncertain times and the State should remain flexible to take advantage of opportunities to reduce costs and achieve greater reductions in carbon emissions using other technologies. And demand proof of benefits. I'm still writing it but that's the gist of it. There are also opportunities for **in person public comment** at hearings next week (see purple highlights). If any of you are up for trip to Springfield to do this, please let me know. I'm trying to make room in my schedule. **Any opposition gives the State a better basis for holding the line as much as possible so I hope you will submit a comment, even a short one, and/or go to one of the hearings. Thank you.**

Carolyn